



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/209,982	12/09/1998	MICHAEL KAPLINSKY	08305/050001	6236

7590 06/29/2005

Micron Technology, Inc.  
c/o Tom D'Amico  
Dickstein, Shapiro, Moran & Oshinsky  
2101 L Street, NW  
Washington, DC 20037-1526

EXAMINER

VILLECCO, JOHN M

ART UNIT PAPER NUMBER

2612

DATE MAILED: 06/29/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

**Office Action Summary**

Application No.

09/209,982

Applicant(s)

KAPLINSKY, MICHAEL

Examiner

John M. Villecco

Art Unit

2612

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

**Period for Reply**

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

**Status**

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 14 March 2005.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

**Disposition of Claims**

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1,3-9,11-13,15-18,21 and 22 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1,3-9,11-13,15-18,21 and 22 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

**Application Papers**

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 13 June 2003 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
- Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

**Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119**

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
  2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
  3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

**Attachment(s)**

- |  |   |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)  | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)<br>Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)                                   | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)             |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)<br>Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____  |

## **DETAILED ACTION**

### ***Response to Arguments***

1. The objection to the drawings in the previous office action is withdrawn. Applicant's attempt at showing the color correction matrix in response filed on June 13, 2003, appears to show the color correction matrix disposed in the image processor.
2. Applicant's arguments filed March 14, 2005 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

Regarding claims 1, 6 and 13, applicant argues that since Kim discloses the use of a both a gray level correction matrix and a color correction matrix, Kim fails to disclose the use a single correction matrix used in the color correction. However, it is clear from the specification of Kim that the applicant's arguments are directed towards only one embodiment. The applicant relies on the embodiment shown in Figure 5. Clearly, a second embodiment shown in Figure 4 shows all of the limitations of claim 1. As shown in Figure 4, only a single color correction matrix is used in the color correction process. Therefore, Kim does disclose "obtaining an error measure for each of the plurality of known reference colors, said error measure representing a difference between said reference outputs and what would be expected for each of said reference outputs". Additionally, Kim does disclose "obtaining a single, color correction matrix by simultaneously minimizing each of said respective error measures to obtain optimum overall correction for the plurality of known reference colors". The single color correction matrix is interpreted to be the color correction matrix (51). For a discussion of the embodiment shown in Figure 4, see column 13, line 10 to column 14, line 37.

Art Unit: 2612

As mentioned in the previous office action, it appears that the applicant is trying to make a correlation between the gray level correction that is taking place in Kim using the gray level matrix (52) and the white balance that is being claimed by the applicant. Firstly, Kim teaches that the gray level correction matrix (52) is used not for white balance but for matching the gray level reproduction characteristic with the visual characteristic of the human being. In other words, the gray level matrix is used for gamma correction (col. 16, lines 42-54). Secondly, the gray level correction of Kim is performed using the achromatic portion (11) of the test chart (10). However the examiners previous rejection points out that the chromatic portion (12) of the test chart (10) is being relied upon. The chromatic portion (12) of the test chart includes various shades of white as shown in Figure 3. Since the error measurement for white and all of the other colors of the test chart (10) are being generated for the color correction matrix (51), the exact same processing is being performed as in the applicant's invention. In other words, since the white is included in the test chart (10), the image is being white-balanced. Therefore, Kim does disclose a single color correction matrix (51) that applies the color correction coefficients to image data to provide color corrected and white balanced image data.

3. For the reasons stated on the preceding pages, the rejections from the previous office action will be repeated.

### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102***

4. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

Art Unit: 2612

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

**5. Claims 1, 4-8, and 12 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Kim (U.S. Patent No. 6,320,668).**

6. Regarding *claim 1*, Kim discloses a color correction apparatus and method in an imaging system. Kim discloses obtaining reference outputs from an image sensor using a color image array (20). The reference outputs are derived from a chromaticity chart shown as reference number 12 in Figure 3. The chromaticity chart includes the primary colors (red, green, and blue) as well as 21 additional colors for a total of 24 colors. The system receives an input from a colorimeter and compares it to the input reference data. The system then operates to reduce an error between the colorimetric scanning data and the data obtained by scanning the chromatic test pattern (12) by computing a color coefficient correction matrix. See column 13, lines 40-64 and column 21, lines 18-50. In this manner the system is optimized for each of the input colors and color-corrected image is obtained. The applicant's claim is directed toward performing color correction also including gray scale references as colors. Therefore, as shown in Figure 3, the last line of the chromatic portion (12) of the test chart (10) is interpreted to be a gray scale line (col. 12, lines 25-27) used in the color correction.

7. Regarding *claim 4*, Kim discloses using 24 colors in the color chart (12). Thus, the system uses at least 7 colors. See column 12, lines 15-30.

8. As for *claim 5*, Kim discloses using 24 colors in the color chart. See column 12, lines 15-30.

Art Unit: 2612

9. With regard to **claim 6**, Kim discloses a color correction apparatus and method in an imaging system. Kim discloses obtaining reference outputs from an image sensor using a color image array (20). A spectral optical system is used which includes a color resolution filter (col. 7, lines 45). The system outputs spectral information regarding the RGB colors (col. 13, lines 46 and 47). This amounts to an interpolation to determine all color components that impinge on the pixel. The reference outputs are derived from a chromaticity chart shown as reference number 12 in Figure 3. The chromaticity chart includes the primary colors (red, green, and blue) as well as 21 additional colors for a total of 24 colors. The system receives an input from a colorimeter and compares it to the input reference data. The system then operates to reduce an error between the colorimetric scanning data and the data obtained by scanning the chromatic test pattern (12) by computing a color coefficient correction matrix. See column 13, lines 40-64 and column 21, lines 18-50. The color correction-processing unit acts as the image interpolator since it performs the color correction. In this manner the system is optimized for each of the input colors and color-corrected image is obtained. The applicant's claim is directed toward performing color correction also including gray scale references as colors. Therefore, as shown in Figure 3, the last line of the chromatic portion (12) of the test chart (10) is interpreted to be a gray scale line (col. 12, lines 25-27) used in the color correction.

10. Regarding **claim 7**, Kim discloses that the color chart (12) includes red, green, blue, white, and 20 additional colors. See column 12, lines 15-30.

11. As for **claim 8**, Kim discloses using 24 colors in the color chart. See column 12, lines 15-30.

Art Unit: 2612

12. Regarding *claim 12*, Kim discloses using each color of the color chart (12) to produce a color correction matrix. See column 11, line 65 to column 12, line 41.

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

13. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

14. **Claims 3, 9, 11, 13, 15-18, 21, and 22 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kim (U.S. Patent No. 6,320,668) in view of Yamaguchi (Japanese Publ. No. 02-074367 A).**

15. Regarding *claim 15*, as mentioned above in the discussion of claim 1, Kim discloses all of the limitations of the parent claim. However, Kim fails to disclose weighting certain colors more than others. Yamaguchi, on the other hand, discloses that it is well known in the art to weigh some colors more than others when constructing a color correction matrix. See the abstract. By choosing certain colors to be weighted more than others, the system is placing more emphasis on specific colors. By placing more emphasis on certain colors such as flesh tones, the colors which are important and to which the eyes are more sensitive will be emphasized, thus producing a higher quality image. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to emphasize the error measurements of specific colors in Kim so that colors which are important to an image are given more weight, thereby forming a better image.

Art Unit: 2612

16. As for **claim 3**, as shown in column 13, lines 40-62, Kim discloses calculating a minimum value for each of the error values of the red green and blue components of the input colors. In this case the reference is denoted as  $P_{Ri}$ ,  $P_{Gi}$ , and  $P_{Bi}$ . The input colorimetric data is denoted as  $\underline{P}_{Ri}$ ,  $\underline{P}_{Gi}$ , and  $\underline{P}_{Bi}$ . The process for calculating a minimum value for each of the error values of the red, green, and blue components would inherently be the same as the process for computing the error between the grey level corrected signals and the colorimetric scanning data as described on column 21, lines 1-65.

17. As for **claim 16**, as mentioned above in the discussion of claim 15, Yamaguchi discloses weighing flesh tones more than others. See the abstract.

18. Regarding **claim 21**, Yamaguchi discloses weighing certain colors more than others (i.e. flesh tones). Additionally, Yamaguchi teaches that a weighing factor is applied to specific colors within the color correction matrix in order to weigh flesh tones more heavily. See the abstract. The fact that flesh tones are weighed more than other less important colors, shows that Kim is concerned with the impact of the flesh tones on the image quality.

19. With regard to **claim 9**, as mentioned above in the discussion of claim 6, Kim discloses all of the limitations of the parent claim. However, Kim fails to disclose weighting certain colors more than others. Yamaguchi, on the other hand, discloses that it is well known in the art to weigh some colors more than others when constructing a color correction matrix. See the abstract. By choosing certain colors to be weighted more than others, the system is placing more emphasis on specific colors. By placing more emphasis on certain colors such as flesh tones, the colors which are important and to which the eyes are more sensitive will be emphasized, thus producing a higher quality image. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill



Art Unit: 2612

in the art at the time the invention was made to emphasize the error measurements of specific colors in Kim so that colors which are important to an image are given more weight, thereby forming a better image.

20. With regard to *claim 11*, as mentioned above in the rejection of claim 6, it is obvious to weight colors which are important (and to which the eye is more sensitive to), higher than other colors, so that a higher quality image is formed. It is well known in the art that red, green, and blue are very important colors, and thus it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to weigh these colors more than the dull colors.

21. As for *claim 17*, the equations represented by the color correction processing unit would inherently be solved simultaneously in Kim.

22. Regarding *claim 22*, Yamaguchi discloses weighing certain colors more than others (i.e. flesh tones). Additionally, Yamaguchi teaches that a weighing factor is applied to specific colors within the color correction matrix in order to weigh flesh tones more heavily. See the abstract. The fact that flesh tones are weighed more than other less important colors, shows that Kim is concerned with the impact of the flesh tones on the image quality.

23. Regarding *claim 18*, as mentioned above in the discussion of claim 6, Kim discloses all of the limitations of the parent claim. However, Kim fails to disclose weighting certain colors more than others. Yamaguchi, on the other hand, discloses that it is well known in the art to weigh some colors more than others when constructing a color correction matrix. See the abstract. By choosing certain colors to be weighted more than others, the system is placing more emphasis on specific colors. By placing more emphasis on certain colors such as flesh tones, the colors which are important and to which the eyes are more sensitive will be emphasized, thus

Art Unit: 2612

producing a higher quality image. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to emphasize the error measurements of specific colors in Kim so that colors which are important to an image are given more weight, thereby forming a better image.

24. As for *claim 13*, Kim discloses a color correction apparatus and method in an imaging system. Kim discloses obtaining reference outputs from an image sensor using a color image array (20). A spectral optical system is used which includes a color resolution filter (col. 7, lines 45). Inherently a color filter operates to supply only light of a certain wavelength to the pixel which it covers. The system outputs spectral information regarding the RGB colors (col. 13, lines 46 and 47). The reference outputs are derived from a chromaticity chart shown as reference number 12 in Figure 3. The chromaticity chart includes the primary colors (red, green, and blue) as well as 21 additional colors for a total of 24 colors. The system receives an input from a colorimeter and compares it to the input reference data. The system then operates to reduce an error between the colorimetric scanning data and the data obtained by scanning the chromatic test pattern (12) by computing a color coefficient correction matrix. See column 13, lines 40-64 and column 21, lines 18-50. In this manner the system is optimized for each of the input colors and color-corrected image is obtained. The applicant's claim is directed toward performing color correction also including gray scale references as colors. Therefore, as shown in Figure 3, the last line of the chromatic portion (12) of the test chart (10) is interpreted to be a gray scale line (col. 12, lines 25-27) used in the color correction.

However, Kim fails to disclose weighting certain colors more than others. Yamaguchi, on the other hand, discloses that it is well known in the art to weigh some colors more than

Art Unit: 2612

others when constructing a color correction matrix. See the abstract. By choosing certain colors to be weighted more than others, the system is placing more emphasis on specific colors. By placing more emphasis on certain colors such as flesh tones, the colors which are important and to which the eyes are more sensitive will be emphasized, thus producing a higher quality image. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to emphasize the error measurements of specific colors in Kim so that colors which are important to an image are given more weight, thereby forming a better image.

25. **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire **THREE MONTHS** from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within **TWO MONTHS** of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the **THREE-MONTH** shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than **SIX MONTHS** from the mailing date of this final action.


Art Unit: 2612

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to John M. Villecco whose telephone number is (571) 272-7319.


The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Wendy Garber can be reached on (571) 272-7308. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).



John M. Villecco  
June 17, 2005



WENDY R. GARBER  
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER  
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2600